

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks.

*Claims 26-32 Are Not Anticipated by Chandrasekhar (WO 00/69525)*

Claims 26-32 stand rejected as anticipated by Chandrasekhar. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 26, the sole independent claim in Claims 26-32, recites, among other limitations, a holder arranged to support a portable electronic device in at least two orientations and a wireless communication device mounted to communicate with the portable electronic device positioned within the holder. Moreover, Claim 26 recites, among other limitations, that the holder is formed of a material that is generally transparent to wireless signals and that is optically opaque.

While the Examiner has rejected Claims 26-32 as anticipated by Chandrasekhar, Applicant disagrees that the reference discloses at least these limitations. First, the holder disclosed by the reference is not configured to support a portable electronic device in at least two orientations. Rather, the holder disclosed by the reference is simply a cradle that docks a single style handheld device in only one orientation. Moreover, even if the cradle could support the device in at least two orientations, there is no disclosure of a wireless communication device, let alone a wireless communications device that is mounted to communicate with the portable electronic device when it is positioned within the holder. The reference only disclosed a wired connection. Furthermore, because there is no disclosure of a wireless connection, there also is no disclosure of a material that is optically opaque while being generally transparent to wireless signals such that the wireless communications device can be obscured from view.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Claims 26-32 are not anticipated by the applied reference. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

*No Disclaimers or Disavowals*

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or

**Application No.:** 10/698,236  
**Filing Date:** October 31, 2003

other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 1.21.2008

By: Robert J. Roby  
Robert J. Roby  
Registration No. 44,304  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20995  
(949) 760-0404

4544770:ah  
111507